

Appln. No. 10/035,321

Response dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office action of November 1, 2005

#### REMARKS

In response to an Official Action dated November 1, 2005, Applicants respectfully submit the following remarks.

This application contains claims 1-32, all of which were rejected in the present Official Action. Reconsideration is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Chang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,848,004). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit herewith a new Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 132 proving that the elements of the present invention that are disclosed but not claimed in Chang were derived from the Applicants in the present patent application. In view of this Declaration, Chang is disqualified as prior art against the present patent application. Therefore, claims 1-32 are believed to be patentable.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments in the present Official Action, the Examiner indicated that the Declaration submitted in response to the previous Official Action in this case was not properly executed, as it was signed by only one of the Applicants. The new Declaration submitted herewith has accordingly been signed by all of the Applicants.

Appln. No. 10/035,321

Response dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office action of November 1, 2005

The Examiner further stated that the previous Declaration raised questions of inventorship. Applicants thank the Examiner for bringing this matter to their attention. Although Hagai Krupnik was inadvertently omitted from the list of inventors when the Application was filed, Applicants have now submitted the documents necessary to add his name as an inventor. The new Declaration also clarifies the role of Dror Orell in reduction to practice of the present invention.

In addition, the Examiner indicated that the previous Declaration did not provide evidence that Chang et al. had actually accessed a proposal describing the present invention (submitted as Appendix A to the Declaration) that was presented to them by Applicants. The new Declaration submitted herewith includes additional e-mail correspondence (reproduced in Appendices D and E of the Declaration) proving that Chang et al. read and made use of the information provided to them by Applicants.

The new Declaration also points out the specific correspondence between the claims in the present patent application and the information in Appendix A.

Applicant believes the remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these remarks, Applicant

Appln. No. 10/035,321

Response dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office action of November 1, 2005

respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Anne M. Kornbau

Registration No. 25,884

AMK:rd

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\colb\ORELL2\PTO\2006-02-01Amend.doc